Department of Energy

Richland Operations Office P.O. Box 550 Richland, Washington 99352 9106218 ()()18544

DEC 2 4 1991

91-ERB-228

10

1

**

~

9

Mr. Timothy L. Nord Hanford Project Manager State of Washington Department of Ecology Mail Stop PV-11 Olympia, Washington 98504-8711

Dear Mr. Nord:

RESPONSE TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY LETTER 191-ERB-703, 100-HR-1 STATEMENT OF WORK FOR THE ELECTRICAL FACILITIES SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN

The subject letter has been reviewed and comment responses are included as Attachment 1 to this letter. The Description of Work (DOW) has been revised to reflect the comment responses and work was initiated on December 9, 1991. A copy of the revised DOW is provided as Attachment 2.

If you have any comments or questions regarding this action, please feel free to contact Mr. James D. Goodenough on (509) 376-7087.

Sincerely,

ERD: JDG

Steven H. Wisness Hanford Project Manager

Attachments: As Stated

cc w/o atts:

P. T. Day, EPA

M. J. Lauterbach, WHC

T. B. Veneziano, WHC

T. M. Wintczak, WHC



CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION COVERSHEET

Author

10

9

Addressee

Correspondence No.

S. H. Wisness, RL (J. M. Ayres, WHC)

T. L. Nord, Ecology

Incoming 9106218 (Xref 9159325D) 18152

subject: RESPONSE TO ECOLOGY LETTER I91-ERB-703, 100-HR-1 STATEMENT OF WORK FOR THE ELECTRICAL FACILITIES SAMPLING & ANALYSIS PLAN

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

Approval	Date	Name	Location	w/att
		Correspondence Control	A3-01	
		M. R. Adams	H4-55	
		J. M. Ayres	H4-55	
		R. J. Bliss, Level 1	B3-04	
		L. C. Brown	H4-51	
		G. D. Carpenter	B2-16	
		C. K. DiSibio	B3-03	
		K. A. Gano	X0-21	
		M. J. Lauterbach	H4-55	
		R. E. Lerch, Assignee	B2-35	
		P. J. Mackey	B3-15	
		H. E. McGuire	B3-63	
		D. B. Pabst	B2-35	
		T. B. Veneziano	B2-35	
		T. M. Wintczak	L4-92	
		R. D. Wojtasek	L4-92	
		EDMC	H4-22	

The attachments are the same as outgoing letter #9159325D. ldp, 6-7049

Response to Ecology Comments on Description of Work - 100-H and 100-B Area Electrical Facilities Source Sampling, dated November 25, 1991

1. General:

- a. This represents a Description of Work (DOW) (referred to previously as a Statement of Work) and not a sampling and analysis plan, as agreed to in the June 27, 1991, 100 Area Work Plan Rescoping Meeting. The DOW is intended to describe the specific Limited Field Investigation activities and sample locations for each operable unit.
- b. An introduction addressing the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Facility Investigation/Corrective Measures Study process and a description of the operable units are not included as part of the DOW. These items are included by reference to the specific Work Plans in Section 1.0 of the DOW.
- c. A reference to the June 27, 1991, meeting will be included in Section 1.0 to explain the use of a DOW.

2. General:

C...

103

10

~.*

0

A section will be added to Section 3 which discusses sampling objectives.

3. General:

General hazards are discussed in the Work Plan. Other potential hazardous and radioactive chemicals which may affect this sampling event are addressed as part of the radiation work permit, the hazardous waste operation permit, or the job safety analysis, as appropriate. These are separate documents and are not part of the DOW. They are approved and available prior to starting work on the site. These are included by reference in Section 2.0.

4. Figure 1, Page 3:

A revised figure will be included.

5. Figure 3, Page 11:

A revised figure will be included.

6. Section 3.1, Page 2:

The text in this section has been revised to be consistent with the Work Plan.

- a. Information on quality and quantity of the sampling events is included in Section 3.2, Section 4.0, and by reference to the appropriate Environmental Investigations Instruction (EII) and SW-846 method.
- b. The reference to the 50 ppm level is not in the revised text.

7. Section 3.1, Page 2:

Table provides this information.

8. Section 3.2, Page 2:

()

10

3

Cr

L

9 64 The text has been revised to include these items.

9. Section 4.0, Page 2:

- a. Field screening was not described because it is not being used.
- b. Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) Level IV analysis is not being used as agreed to in the rescoping discussions.
- c. No radiological sampling is to be conducted at these sites.